

first and second floor of the building that we could have access to at about any time Senator Chambers or others might want to have access to it to solve these problems. Now I think the most curious argument that has been presented in opposition to this amendment by Senator Vickers and others is that somehow by bringing from about eighty or more telephones down to six or fewer the number of lines that are available for misuse, why misuse is going to increase. You know, the way this bill is written it is not just legislators' phone bills that are protected but it is also staff because it is any telephone call related to the performance of duties by a member of the Legislature. That surely will apply to the phones in the Clerk's office, or the phones in the Legislative Fiscal office, to other offices we have that is part of the Legislature that are not the personal phones of the state senators. We have six or eight telephones that are installed in the committee hearing rooms. We have at least fifteen or twenty in the Legislative Fiscal office and the Clerk's office and other similar offices, the Research Office up in the Library, up in the tower there are other offices associated with the Legislature. Currently we have I would estimate at least 75 or 80 different phones that are going to be protected by this legislation and I can't see how this amendment by bringing the protected number of lines down to six or fewer is going to increase the potential for abuse as Senator Vickers is arguing. Now I think that frankly we are making the issue out of this, we are making a much bigger issue out of these phone lines than the press ever is. We are the ones that introduced the bill. We are the ones that are debating these amendments far more extensively than probably need to be debated. But most important, I don't really see what the media has to do with this issue at all. I know Senator Chambers is setting the media up as a straw man and then knocking them down as a convenient rhetorical tactic frequently. But we are not talking about the right of the media to get these records. We are talking about the right of our constituents and the right of the public to know that we are fulfilling the public trust. I don't think how the media reports our business, what they think about cost containment legislation, what they think about our records, our telephone records or any other issue really has anything to do with this particular debate. Our responsibility is to the taxpayers of this state. I think again that it is overly broad to feel that we need to protect all of our records because occasionally we might have a confidential call or two to place. I think this particular amendment balances the privacy interests against the legitimate